

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, let me speak briefly to the motion that is before us insofar as it relates to parts of the supplemental that are not the military branch part; specifically, the Transportation Security Administration, which our subcommittee deals with. The House-passed bill includes some \$3.8 billion in the supplemental for the TSA. We have yet to receive from the TSA the justifications for those figures. Yet the Senate bill, if we go along with this motion, if this motion passes and we have to go to the higher figure in the Senate bill, some \$4.7 billion, we have no justifications for it. I cannot show to my colleagues the documents that say, this is what we actually have to have.

In the House-passed bill, we already gave more than was requested for several items. For example, we said, here is \$20 million. Replace all of the magnetometers in 429 airports in the country, because the new state-of-the-art magnetometers will save the need for a lot of hand wands that are now searching you as you go through. The new machines will do that work for us. It will save many of us taking our shoes off as we go through the airport and having somebody, a federally paid employee, carry your shoes to be searched.

□ 1530

Those requests were not in the administration request. Yet, we put it in there, because we think it will save money down the pike. But we have yet to receive the justifications for the monies that we included in the House-passed version of the bill, which is significantly less for TSA than the Senate figures.

If this motion should pass and we have to go to the higher levels in the Senate bill, then who knows how many employees they are going to hire. At first they said, we need 33,000 people. A few weeks later they said, no, it is going to be more like 60,000. By the time we had our hearing, they were up to 73,000.

We said, whoa, let us stand back and talk about this. So we put a level in our House-passed bill that they cannot exceed in terms of the numbers of employees of TSA during the remainder of this fiscal year, 45,000 people, max. If we have to go to the higher Senate figure, then that personnel level is out the window.

We think it is wise to have some discipline, I say to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), on that hiring process during the remainder of this fiscal year that is covered by the supplemental.

In addition, we also put in the bill monies to allow the air marshals that are flying in the planes to be able to communicate independently to ground stations. That was not requested, and yet we think it is a very important

thing at a modest cost. So I think there are a lot of items in the House-passed bill that perhaps would be negated if we were to have to go to the higher levels on the Senate bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would simply like to say that I completely agree with the remarks made by the gentleman with respect to the Transportation Security Agency. There is no question that that agency so far has been without a clue, and they are out of control. I think the gentleman has played an excellent role in trying to introduce them to reality.

Let me simply say that obviously that agency needs to be straightened out, but I am sure that he understands as well that eventually that agency is going to have to receive more money than is in either bill, probably.

I would be, for instance, very interested in working out a proposal under which we would appropriate the money that is needed to that agency, but hold it in reserve until they meet the standards that the gentleman has laid out, because I think both of us want to deal with the problem. We simply want to make sure we are not throwing money at an agency that does not know what to do with it.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's thoughts, and he is correct. I appreciate the gentleman's comments. We are right now, as the gentleman knows, in the process of gearing up for the 2003 appropriations bills. In fact, I just got off the phone with the Secretary of Transportation about this bill and the 2003 bills coming up. In fact, we hope to mark up the 2003 bills in a few days, even, which will give us the chance to take a second look and see what is needed down the pike in 2003 without having to address that at this particular moment in time.

So I appreciate the gentleman's idea about the need for more funds in homeland security TSA next year, but I do not think we need it now.

I would hope that we would not pass this motion and tie the hands of the gentlemen as they negotiate with the other body. I appreciate the gentleman bringing this motion up because it gives us a chance to talk about the issue, but I would hope that it would not pass, because I do not want to tie the chairman and the ranking member's hands when they go to do battle with the other body.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), another subcommittee chairman on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to instruct conferees of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

I believe that such a motion would prompt almost a guaranteed, if you will, veto, and would absolutely unnecessarily restrict the ability of the conferees in negotiating with the other body.

This is probably the most important bill that we will pass in this Congress, and in some respects, if we were to do this, it may very well jeopardize the passage, or if not jeopardize, certainly bog down the process.

The President has already indicated that he would veto the bill as being too costly, and if we move forward with this motion and go to all those higher levels, then the bill would go well beyond and above the funding level proposed by the Senate.

So for those reasons and the reasons that the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) had covered, and the chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), I would urge Members to vote no on the motion.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I urge a yes vote on the motion to instruct, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LINDER). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4 p.m.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 4 p.m.

□ 1602

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LINDER) at 4 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.

#### APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 4, SECURING AMERICA'S FUTURE ENERGY ACT OF 2001

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4) to enhance energy conservation, research and development and to provide for security and diversity in the energy supply for the American people, and for